2025

HOW TO DO AN EVALUATION

BTEC RULES

Does the level of spelling, punctuation and grammar affect the assessment decision I make?

It is good practice for Assessors to "mark" spelling and grammar i.e., correct mistakes on learner work.

However, mistakes in spelling and grammar should not influence assessment decisions unless:

• the mistakes are so problematic that they undermine the evidence of learner understanding.

• specific assessment criteria require communication, spelling, and grammar and/or the correct use of technical language.

Overall, the evidence, such as a report, will be easy to read and understand by a third party.

It will be logically structured, use appropriate technical language (including definitions) throughout and use a high standard of written language, i.e. consistent use of correct grammar and spelling, and consistent reference of information sources.

BTEC RULES

To have a resubmission you must do the below

The learner has met initial deadlines set in the assignment or has met an agreed deadline extension and has attempted all criteria set in the brief.

If you have attempted the criteria it ***does not mean you have met it***

The learner has correctly authenticated the evidence.

The Assessor judges that the learner will be able to produce improved evidence without further guidance.

The Assessor has authenticated the evidence submitted for assessment.

You will not get a resubmission if you have not done the following

If the learner has not met the conditions set out on the left **you will be capped to a pass.**

HOW TO WRITE AN EVALUATION

You must:

Give **ADAVANTAGES** of what you are trying evaluate. You must provide evidence where necessary.

Give **DISADVANTAGES** of what you are trying to evaluate. You must provide evidence where necessary.

Give a **RECOMMENDATION/CONCLUSION (**own opinion) this must have evidence to back up any points that you made.

Provide areas for improvement. This is part of your own opinion but evidence must back this up.

READ THE SPECIFICATION: THIS CAN BE APPLIED TO ALL UNITS. THIS IS BASED ON 9.2

Evaluate three different projects delivered using different project management methodologies as covered in the unit content.

The evaluation will cover a comprehensive range of benefits and limitations of using a methodology based on the context

A supported judgement will be given that leads to a conclusion

The report, will be easy to read and understand by a third party. It will be logically structured, use appropriate technical language (including definitions) throughout and use a high standard of written language, i.e. consistent use of correct grammar and spelling, and consistent reference of information sources

STRENGTHS OF THE PROJECT (ADVANTAGES)

Thorough Research and Feasibility Analysis: Two potential solutions were researched and evaluated, considering technical feasibility, cost, and risk factors. The feasibility study provided clear criteria for selecting the most viable option.

Effective Planning and Resource Allocation: A detailed resource and time plan was created, ensuring tasks were scheduled logically and efficiently. Project phasing was used to divide user requirements, making the development process more manageable.

Risk Assessment and Control: Identified risks such as budget limitations, technical constraints, and timeline risks were mitigated using contingency planning. Strategies like regular progress monitoring and issue prioritization helped keep the project on track.

Use of Project Management Processes: Various project management processes, including task prioritization, constraint management, and stakeholder communication (through meetings and status updates), ensured smooth execution.

CHALLENGES AND WEAKNESSES (DISADVANTAGES)

Unforeseen Delays: Some development phases took longer than expected due to unforeseen technical difficulties and resource availability issues. While contingency planning helped, further flexibility in scheduling could have improved overall efficiency.

Limited Budget Control: Budget estimations were initially optimistic, and some costs exceeded projections. More detailed financial planning at the feasibility stage would have helped manage this aspect better.

Scope Adjustments: Some project requirements needed to be adjusted mid-development due to evolving user needs. This led to scope creep, which slightly impacted the time plan. More rigid change management processes could have reduced this impact.

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Enhanced Risk Mitigation: Future projects should incorporate more comprehensive risk assessments, including potential technical difficulties and external dependencies.

More Frequent Monitoring and Adaptation: While project control mechanisms were in place, more frequent evaluations could have helped in identifying and addressing issues earlier.

Improved Budget Forecasting: More detailed cost estimations and financial contingencies should be included in future planning to avoid budget overruns.